

August 17, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19993

which receipts into the National Resources Trust Fund would be allocated. This is a job for the experts and one that cannot be answered definitively at the present time.

The specific use or uses to which this fund would be put in later years would be left up to the future authorizations and appropriations of the Congress, based upon and closely associated with the several other programs already in operation.

However, if enacted, I would assume that the newly created Water Resources Council in the Office of the President would be helpful in presenting to the appropriate committees of Congress the order of priorities to which these funds could be directed in the coming years. The Water Resources Council, made up of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Army, HEW and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission has been charged with the responsibility of studying, on a continuing basis, the adequacy of water supplies, as well as establishing comprehensive regional and river projects. In addition, just last week the President signed into law a bill authorizing the Secretary of Interior to spend \$220 million during the next 6 fiscal years for the saline water conversion program. Moreover, the Congress presently has in conference major amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act of 1962 which would have a direct relationship with any programs financed from receipts held in a National Water Resources Trust Fund.

In short, the bill I am introducing is aimed at creating and earmarking revenue for water resources development. We are a nation with the technological ability to place a man on the moon within the next few years. There can be no doubt that we have the technological ability to solve our Nation's water problems. A far more bedeviling problem for the Congress, however, will be to find the source of revenue without which all of the proposed solutions will remain as little more than dusty blueprints. My bill is directed to this end.

#### FOGGY THINKING AT FOGGY BOTTOM

(Mr. HARSHA (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of the Members are not aware that a consular convention between the United States and Russia was signed at Moscow on June 1, 1965, providing for the regulation of the consular affairs of each country in the territory of the other and further providing for complete immunity from prosecution for all criminal violations by employees and Consular officials. Unfortunately, on recommendation of the State Department and Secretary of State Rusk, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has recommended that the Senate give its advice and consent. As yet, the Senate has not acted on this recommendation and I take this opportunity to call this

fact to the attention of the House, urging that they in turn alert their constituents so that the constituents may voice their objections to the Senate—for in this way, and this way only—can the ratification of this treaty be prohibited.

This consular convention treaty with the Soviet Union is one of the most dangerous and preposterous mistakes that has yet been advocated by the State Department. This is another dangerous error in a long list of miscalculations of Russian intentions by the State Department, and only an aroused American public can stop Senate ratification of this treaty. The treaty signed in 1964 by Russia would allow Russia and other Communist nations to expand consular agencies in the United States and to staff them with intelligence agents and other operatives who would be immune from prosecution in the United States for espionage or other criminal violations. This convention is the first to which the United States has been a party which provided for unlimited exemption from criminal jurisdiction for consular personnel, and provides the basis for a nationwide Communist spy and subversion ring with protection from prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover has warned that such an agreement was a "cherished goal of Soviet intelligence services." He said:

None but the most naive and totally misinformed would doubt but that the Communists will take full advantage of such a treaty to expand their espionage and subversion activities in this country under the cloak of protection provided by this treaty.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clear indication of the foggy thinking at Foggy Bottom and is a prime example of why the American public has little faith in the activities of our State Department.

#### AN APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM OF THE LOS ANGELES RIOTS

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the situation which has existed in Los Angeles these past few days has distressed and saddened us all, whether representing a congressional district in or near the so-called Watts area, as I do, or anywhere in the United States. Distressed and saddened are scarcely adequate to describe my own feelings, and frankly, I must confess I am still somewhat numb at the events I witnessed in Los Angeles last weekend.

Last night on ABC-TV, on the "Night Life" program, Les Crane talked by telephone with Dick Gregory, the noted comedian. Mr. Gregory, you may recall, was at the scene of the rioting, and was wounded a few nights ago. His remarks, I think, merit some attention.

Mr. Gregory first compared the situation to a hurricane—if you were not there, you just could not fully appreciate it, and in this I wholly concur. He further commented that if such an outbreak occurred in a foreign land, we would know precisely how to control and handle the matter. And then he recalled that when Russia put up the first

Sputnik, we lost no time in accepting the challenge of the space race, and immediately hired, with little thought for cost, the very best brainpower and technicians available to speed our efforts toward putting a man on the moon. Mr. Gregory suggested that very same effort and disregard for expense be directed toward solving the question of why these riots occurred in Los Angeles, and toward correcting the reasons when they are determined. I do not pretend to know all the answers right now. But I do believe Mr. Gregory's suggestion merits some attention by the Congress, and I am going to give some further thought and study to this idea with a view to making some pertinent recommendations in this area.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, if it is proper to do so, may I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana who has a special order to address the House today be recognized at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the late President Kennedy in early 1961 gave voice to the most ambitious and most noble program of regional development ever undertaken in the Western Hemisphere. It was on March 13, 1961, to the assembled Ambassadors of all the American nations that President Kennedy enunciated a bold and far reaching—and at the same time, hardheaded—social and economic program by which the peoples of this hemisphere could realize the benefits of their rising expectation. Five months later representatives of the Organization of American States signed the Charter of Punta del Este, and the Alliance for Progress was formally launched.

It is this fourth anniversary of the launching of the Alliance for Progress which we commend today. President Kennedy's sweeping vision to strengthen hemispheric unity and provide the peoples of Latin America, through self-help, with the opportunity to raise their living standards, has been carried forward with energy and imagination by President Johnson and the progressive leaders, both public and private, of Latin America.

There are those who say, after 4 years of the Alliance, that the high flown words which launched this program were too ambitious, too visionary, and that the advances which could possibly be achieved in the 1960's would fall far short of the proposed goals. But clear call to

19994

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- HOUSE

August 17, 1965

action, galvanized by noble words, was needed to initiate concrete beginnings for the Alliance. The fact is that the Alliance program has realized progress in its first 4 years of life; and I am confident that in the next 4 years, we will see an even greater measure of advances.

As my fellow colleagues know, the Alliance for Progress is not a giveaway program—it asks much of the leaders and the peoples of the American nations to the south. It demands of them social and economic sacrifices in the form of investment, tax reform, land reform, price stabilization, and other areas—and I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, the start of these necessary reforms is fully discernible on this fourth anniversary. We must be prepared for this massive joint effort to continue, not just through the sixties because this decade will witness only the first step in a long journey, but rather for many decades beyond. We must be prepared for a sustained effort in order to overcome the deprivations of 500 years of history.

Particularly in this hemisphere, where there is great disparity between the living standards of the people of the United States and those of the other American nations, this unfulfilled task presents us with a tremendous challenge. The obstacles are herculean, but so is our collective will, our ingenuity, our energy, our determination—of this, I am confident. Progress we are making, and we shall continue to do so.

I am convinced that the realization of the goals of the alliance is the best avenue to bring economic and political stability to all of the American countries, and to stem the efforts of communism to seize control of more nations in our hemisphere, and subjugate their peoples. Communism will gain no more foothold in this hemisphere, if we maintain our sustained drive and our unity of purpose. The Alliance offers the best means for the peoples of Latin America to attain, by peaceful evolution, their rising expectations.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD, a fine editorial in the Washington Post of August 17, 1965, commending the progress made by the Alliance program in its first 4 years of operation. The editorial follows:

#### THE ALIANZA'S FOURTH

Four years ago today, 19 Latin American countries and the United States signed the Charter of Punta del Este which created the Alliance for Progress. It is an appropriate day for taking stock of what has been accomplished during those 4 years.

The birth of the Alliance marked an historic turning point in U.S. policy toward Latin America. Prior to Punta del Este, that policy was guided by the slogan of "trade, not aid"; it was a policy that relied on large-scale private investment and the growth of international trade to supply the vital catalyst for sustained economic growth. But that policy was far too passive for a world torn by political instability and ferocious competition between rival ideologies. An active policy, one designed to stimulate economic growth in Latin America through a working partnership of the 20 governments was the only answer.

After 4 years of experience, it is not at all difficult for a critic to point out the cracks and fissures in the house that has been built.

It can be charged, and with some justice, that the rhetoric employed in launching the Alianza gave rise to expectations that could not be reasonably fulfilled; that it had been difficult to push programs through the bureaucratic thicket in Washington; that the individual Latin American countries have been more interested in extracting the maximum volume of aid from this country than in drawing up sound plans or coordinating their efforts with other recipient countries.

These and other charges are not without substance, but they should not be permitted to obscure the very real accomplishments of the Alianza. At \$12 billion, the Latin American investment in economic and social development is running 50 percent above the target level established by the Charter. U.S. commitments for economic assistance have reached \$4.4 billion. There has been some progress—although it is insufficient—in achieving monetary and fiscal reform in Latin America. And perhaps most important, the machinery has been established for a continuing program of economic assistance and cooperation.

What of the future? The Inter-American Committee on the Alliance, a ministerial group known as CIAP, has forwarded a number of valuable recommendations for change to President Johnson. Most of them are unexceptionable. U.S. aid to Latin America should be untied, and as a first step, the recipient countries might be permitted to make purchases in Latin America, Canada or Japan, transactions not likely to weaken markedly this country's balance-of-payments position. Where they have any likelihood of success, this country should become a party to additional commodity agreements aimed at stabilizing the prices of the tropical produce on which Latin America heavily depends for foreign exchange. Land reform and other programs designed to modernize rural life in Latin America are sorely needed.

The proposal for preferential tariffs, however circumscribed, is thoroughly objectionable. If this country, in violation of the principles of nondiscrimination, were to grant the Latin American countries preferential tariffs, it would be productive of little good. Imports of cotton textiles, the one class of products for which Latin America has a clear advantage, are restricted by quotas. The argument that Latin America must have U.S. tariff preferences because the Europeans discriminate against her in favor of their former African dependencies is a non sequitur. Latin American commodities are hardly affected by U.S. tariffs, and granting her preferences would do nothing to improve access to the European markets. In fact it might slam the door even tighter.

There is a story which is commended to all those who are so impatient or naive as to believe that there is an express train to rapid economic progress in Latin America. An admiring American guest asked his titled British host to tell him the secret of his magnificent lawns. "It's all very simple," replied his Lordship. "You must prepare the ground with great care, choose the right sort of seed and wait a hundred years."

It will not require a century to uncover the formula for sustained economic growth in Latin America, but we ought to be prepared for a long haul, one in which progress is reckoned in decades, not in months or years. And over that longer haul the Alianza para el Progreso must be constantly strengthened by the infusions of fresh talent and new ideas.

One of the most heartening aspects of the progress being made by the Alliance is the vital role which the private sector is playing in advancing this extensive program. This is true, Mr. Speaker, both in our country and in the nations of

Latin America. Specifically, the newly organized Business Council for Latin America is composed of leading businessmen, representing major American companies and industries with extensive operations in Latin America. These business leaders in our country are joining with private enterprise leaders in the other American nations in actively supporting many projects under the Alliance program. These Business Council members, who are directed by the able Mr. David Rockefeller, of the Chase Manhattan Bank, also are working with the Agency for International Development and other Government agencies to help make the Alliance program a success. The council is coordinating the views of U.S. business and their members participation in the Alliance.

Further, AID's part in encouraging private participation in the Alliance continues to achieve headway through the partners of the Alliance program. AID established this program last year, so that State and local Chambers of Commerce, civic clubs, unions, business and professional groups, schools and individuals, can work directly with groups of people in Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, a fine example of direct participation in the Alliance is taking place in my own home city of New Orleans, La., the gateway to the Americas. I refer to the training seminars being provided at the Inter-American Center of Loyola University for some 150 young, potential leaders from the Republics of Central America. The university signed a contract with aid to provide these 6-week training seminars at its Inter-American Center, under the able direction and guidance of Father Louis Twomey, S.J., and his staff. Loyola has been assisted in offering these seminars by some of the faculty and staff of Tulane University; of Louisiana State University; and of Dillard and Xavier Universities.

In these seminars, the young leaders of Central America consider problems of social, economic, and political development; and of techniques to solve them through group action and effective leadership. These potential Central American leaders come from credit unions and cooperatives; rural communities; normal schools; universities, and political and business groups—in short, all sectors of society in Central America. This contract between a university in our country and AID was the first of its kind in our Government's efforts to provide leadership training for potential leaders in the developing nations of Latin America.

For more than 2 decades, Mr. Speaker, a great organization in my city has been the prime mover in fostering good will, trade and private investment between the nations of Latin America, and New Orleans, the State of Louisiana and the lower Mississippi Valley. This is International House, under the guidance today of Mr. Paul Fabry as managing director, and a blue-ribbon group of officers from business and industry in the New Orleans area. Through its annual Pan-American seminar, which brings together leading editors from our country